



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

money to do their work with — the most costly misuse of human life we are engaged in. And then we talk about having plenty of money for army and navy, for military show, for the pomp and circumstance of mimic or real war!

But deeper than lack of money is the lack of faith in the developing power of moral influences and agencies. People are recreant to the ideals of human life that Emerson, whose name we are frequently taking upon our lips at this time, preached to us. We do not believe what Channing said: "Every human soul is sacred, unspeakably so, and therefore every child has a right to the best development society can afford." It is because we do not believe these things as we should that we are indifferent, and the money does not come for the real uplifting agencies, but goes for destruction and then for patching and mending.

And why do we not believe in moral forces? It is because many of us have not learned that they are the only real forces. If you put a hand upon a human being, or a nation puts its hand upon another nation, to hold that human being or to hold that nation by artificial pressure, you have done absolutely nothing to that human being and nothing to that nation to elevate them, no matter what superficial advantages you may have offered to them or they may have accepted. Only when there is a response from within can there be growth, and it is moral forces alone that win this response. These are truisms, but if we believed them we could regenerate the world! [Applause.]

### A Horrid Dream.

*Address of Governor Garvin at the recent dedication of the Rhode Island monument at Andersonville.*

The memories aroused by this spot are sad ones, but the occasion itself calls for the deepest gratitude. We may indeed be thankful to meet here, in an unbroken nation — as brothers, once estranged, but now knit together in the bonds of a common history and a common destiny.

Those of us who, on either side, participated in the Civil War, look back upon it as a horrid dream. We wonder that a self-governing people could have been so irrational and so hard-hearted as to try to settle their differences by the arbitrament of war.

The four bloody years serve to remind us how small an advance our boasted civilization has made from barbarism, — how little, indeed, we have risen above the brutes.

A few generations ago dueling was regarded in the same light that war now is. When two acquaintances had a difference, the code of honor permitted, and under some circumstances was thought to compel, them to meet in mortal combat. Yet, looking back upon the proceeding, in what respect did it differ, in morals or in its effects, from any street brawl? In what way would it have been worse for Alexander Hamilton, his friends or his country, had he been done to death by a burglar, instead of a political opponent?

To go upon the field of honor — God save the mark — for the purpose and with the intent to kill another is murder in the first degree, even though that other is

equally armed and equally bent upon destruction. The whole procedure is irrational, savage, brutal.

War is dueling writ large. Although we do not as yet see it, to settle a dispute by the method of war, or to class its declaration with other ways of arriving at international agreement, is to place all who are responsible therefor upon a level with the wild beasts, and the individual who is most responsible needs courage only to make him a modern Nero.

Brutal itself, every war begets a brood of cruelties. Weyler's reconcentrado policy in Cuba aroused our people to a high pitch of righteous indignation. Had we then been charged with being equally inhuman, our answer in all sincerity would have been: "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?" And yet within two years we had adopted a similar policy in the Philippines, and had added to the Spanish ferocity the "water cure" and the giving of no quarter.

About the same time a still more destructive reconcentrado policy was adopted by the mighty British empire in dealing with the Boers of South Africa.

In the opinion of the Southern people, the devastation by the Northern army in the Shenandoah Valley and in Sherman's march to the sea was unnecessary and inexcusable. So thought the North of the sufferings of prisoners here in Andersonville.

Indeed, when a nation embarks upon the work of slaughter, has staked success, and, it may be, its very existence upon the decision of the battlefield, any laws of war — which in their nature are arbitrary — have but slight binding force upon either combatant. In a business where murder, arson, robbery and fraud are counted as virtues, receiving the highest praise and the greatest reward, it certainly is a fine distinction to say that prisoners should be well treated, and that non-combatants, together with their property, should be protected.

The veterans of the Civil War have, I believe, been conservators of peace; assuredly this is true of the rank and file. After witnessing the ravages of the march and the carnage of the battlefield, they were ready to echo the words of General Sherman, "War is hell."

Unlike a volunteer soldiery, a standing army is a continual menace to the pursuits of peace. Regular officers, so far as their influence extends, are fomenters of war, ever ready to transmute the smiling face of nature into war's horrid visage. Again, the civil department of our national government, with whom the power to declare war rests, has on many occasions shown itself only too ready to second in this respect the wishes of the military branch.

I have long wished that the presidents and the congressmen who are in haste to enter upon an unnecessary or aggressive war could be compelled to go upon the firing line. No doubt if such a requirement existed, peace would be perpetual, since these verbal fire-eaters, as a rule, take precious good care to keep themselves at a safe distance from the hum of shot and shell.

The war between the states sprang directly from an incompetent and misrepresentative Congress. Nobody now desires the reestablishment of slavery, and the inherent viciousness of that institution might and would, under wise leadership, have been recognized and ended without a bloody emancipation.

What we need in the United States above all else, in order to establish perpetual peace with our neighbors, goodwill between all sections, justice between man and man, and a steady advance in prosperity of which all shall be partakers, is a system of just representation — a system which will give to each minority party, as well as to each majority, its due proportion in every legislative body, municipal, state and national. Had such existed before the Civil War, the union-loving people, both North and South, would have been represented in Congress much more largely, and the action of that body, guided by the light of reason instead of folly, would have written for this country another and a far brighter page in its history.

Certain persons, who give to strenuousness the highest place in the list of virtues, are prating of an irrepressible conflict between the Saxon and the Slav. In grandiloquent phrase, as though speaking ex-cathedra, they predict that either Russia, on the one hand, or an Anglo-Saxon alliance, on the other, is destined to rule the world, and that the present century will see one of these powers subjugated by the other. Such talk is worthy of consideration only because it tends to bring about the deplorable events it foretells. How much better and more rational to look forward to a federation of nations, a greater United States, not of the Americas alone, but of the whole world.

Let every brave man's death in this prison, let every monument here erected to his memory, be flagstones paving the way to universal peace.

And may that road be short.

## Civilization Not Advanced by Armies.

*From a sermon by Rev. Leighton Parks, D. D., of Boston.*

When the story is written — and it has not yet been written — of the awful suffering that has followed the advance of civilization in India, in Madagascar, in Java, in the Philippines and in China, our children's children will stand appalled and wonder how we could have done it, just as we wonder how our fathers could have suffered the delusion of the witches. We are not so far advanced as we think we are, and when I say "we" I mean the most favored nations.

Now some one will say: "This is the talk of a minister, and not of a man of practical affairs. If a man who knows the world were to deal with this subject, he would know that you cannot carry the blessings of civilization except — we will not say by cruelty — no, we will not say by manifest injustice — no, but you cannot carry the blessings of civilization except by force." Now you would repudiate force as applied to yourselves. Yes; but it is necessary, we are told, in carrying civilization to the backward nations. And the proof, so it is asserted — the proof is that all through history it has been the army that has carried civilization (such as it was), and if you took the armed force away from the state anarchy would result.

Now, in answer to that, I venture to ask you to consider, my friends, whether this be the true state of the case; for I am convinced, for one, that it is *not* the true state of the case; that we have been deceived by the historians; that the battles of the world have filled so

graphic a space in picture that our attention has been drawn to them as if *they* were the real cause of the advance of civilization, when I believe they were nothing of the sort.

Indeed, I would go farther, and I venture the assertion that these things have hindered more than they have helped. Now, do not misunderstand me; I believe that in the state, just as in the city, there must be a police force, and that order must be kept wherever a government exists. We will have no discussion about that. The point is this: Has civilization been advanced by the army? I say, No!

Then it is answered: "Well, such civilization as we have come, did it not, from the Roman Empire?" Yes, largely. "Well, the Roman Empire extended its borders by force of arms, did it not?" Yes. "Very well, then, is it not true that but for the force of arms of Rome we should not have the civilization in which we now rejoice?" And I answer, No; it's not true! For here, have you ever considered what countries Rome really conquered? They were, first, the Provinces of Italy; they were Spain and Gaul, the littoral of North Africa, a part of Egypt and a part of Asia Minor. That is all Rome ever conquered. Now where are those nations to-day? Are they in the van of civilization?

Now what did Rome try to conquer? She tried to conquer the Germans, and she never was able to penetrate the German forests and hold those people in subjection; and out of the German forests have come Germany, England and the United States. Captain Mahan has told us in one of his most interesting books that the Roman Empire held back the invasion of the barbarians for two hundred years, and gave an opportunity for the Goths to become Christianized before they flowed down into Italy. That is quite true; but what was the Roman Empire doing then? It was standing on the defensive; it had long ago given up any attempt to conquer these unconquerable people. The people who went into the German forests and converted your fathers and mine were the Arian missionaries who carried nothing with them but the Gospel, and but for those men you and I would never have received the civilization in which we rejoice. For had those barbarians that invaded Italy and trampled out the ancient civilization been un-Christianized, exactly the same effect would have followed as from the invasion of the Moslems; but inasmuch as they were Christianized they heard with respect the voice of bishop and priest and monk, and received submissively the laws and customs and thought of Rome. A Roman army invaded England, but when the pressure came upon the Empire those garrisons had to be recalled, and England reverted, and not one trace, beyond a Roman pavement here and there and a splendid road, was left of the Roman occupation. But when Augustine landed on the coast of Kent he brought Roman law, Roman custom, Roman civilization.

It is not true that we who are carrying civilization in the van of the onward march of humanity to-day have received it from the power of the arms of Rome. We have received it from men whom those arms were never able to conquer.

And I instance one more example, in modern history, which many here can still remember, and that is the opening of Japan. Instead of occupying Japan, we